



October 24, 2012

Henry Lafferty
1619 Lynwood Avenue
Winston-Salem, NC 27104

Bryce A. Stuart Municipal Building
100 E. First Street
P.O. Box 2511
Winston-Salem, NC 27102
CityLink 311 (336.727.8000)
Fax 336.748.3163
www.cityofws.org/planning

RE: ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT UDO-233

Dear Mr. Lafferty:

The attached report of the Planning Board to the City of Winston-Salem City Council is sent to you at the request of the Council Members.

When the text amendment is scheduled for public hearing, you will be notified by the City Secretary, of the date on which the City Council will hear this petition.

Sincerely,

A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning

Attachment

pc: City Secretary
Tom Terrell, 300 N. Greene St., Greensboro, NC 27401
John Coyne, 214 N. Hawthorne Rd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104
Langdon Oppermann, 1500 Overbrook Ave., Winston-Salem, NC 27104.
Ben Towle, 1581 W. Northwest Blvd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104
Anne O'Brien, 2301 Buena Vista Rd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104
Bill Gibson, 1315 Brookstown Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27101
Kathleen Ramich, 1318 Glade Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101
Darrell Walker, 475 Corporate Square Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27105
Bill Powell, 475 Corporate Square Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27105
Drew Davis, Spillman Thomas & Battle, 110 Oakwood Dr., Suite 500, Winston-Salem, NC 27103
Stan Dean, 215 NW Pine Valley Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104
Brad Fisher, 301 N. Hawthorne Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104
Patricia Sokoloff, 707 Summit Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

ACTION REQUEST FORM

DATE: October 24, 2012
TO: The Honorable Mayor and City Council
FROM: A. Paul Norby, FAICP, Director of Planning

COUNCIL ACTION REQUEST:

Request for Public Hearing on Zoning Text Amendment proposed by Henry Lafferty

SUMMARY OF INFORMATION:

Zoning Text Amendment proposed by Henry Lafferty to amend Chapter B of the *Unified Development Ordinances* to amend the review requirements for school stadiums in Growth Management Area 2; continued from the August 9, 2012 Planning Board meeting (UDO-233).

PLANNING BOARD ACTION: TIE VOTE

MOTION ON PETITION: APPROVAL

FOR: DARRYL LITTLE, BARRY LYONS, LYNNE MITCHELL

AGAINST: ARNOLD KING, PAUL MULLICAN, ALLAN YOUNGER

EXCUSED: WESLEY CURTIS

MOTION FAILED DUE TO TIED VOTE: REPORT FORWARDED WITH NEITHER APPROVAL NOR DENIAL RECOMMENDATION

SITE PLAN ACTION: NOT REQUIRED

STAFF REPORT

DOCKET #: UDO-233

STAFF: [David Reed](#)

REQUEST

This text amendment (UDO-233) is proposed by Henry Lafferty to amend Chapter B of the *Unified Development Ordinances* (UDO) to amend the use conditions for School Stadiums.

BACKGROUND

The proposed text amendment would apply to all schools, existing and future, in Growth Management Areas (GMA) 1 (City/Town Centers) and 2 (Urban Neighborhoods). The implications of the proposed changes go beyond any particular site.

In 2005, some changes were proposed to the off-street parking requirements for schools relating to bus parking for elementary and middle schools and stadium parking for high schools (UDO-146). UDO-146 was reviewed and recommended for approval by the Planning Board in October 2005. At the subsequent City Council public hearing, Council remanded the stadium parking issue to the Planning Board, expressing concerns about the parking problems that have been experienced at non-school events. The amendment was subsequently discussed at the Council's Community Development/Housing/General Government Committee, where the Committee agreed that the amendment should be supported, as proposed.

The changes to the stadium parking requirements, which eliminated the need for stadium parking above and beyond the parking required for the school itself, were adopted by the City Council in 2006 and eliminated the requirement that parking be calculated at one space per three seats in an on-site school stadium. The premise behind that change was that given the size of typical on-campus stadiums, the parking otherwise required plus temporary space on campus would be sufficient to handle the demand for stadium parking. The parking for schools with or without stadiums is now calculated the same way by calculating one space per five students plus one space per faculty/staff.

Two of the newest high schools in the county, Atkins and Reagan were built using the old pre UDO-146 stadium seating requirement. They were both approved shortly before the text amendment was proposed and, at the time of approval, each school proposed a 1,500 seat stadium. Reagan has since increased the size of its stadium and has also provided additional parking. Larger stadiums that could generate greater parking needs than what is required for the school present a more challenging parking solution at those times when the stadium is used at full capacity. Suburban schools generally have more land and with good topography, they can supplement paved parking areas with parking on grassed areas, for example.

ANALYSIS

There has been a trend to reduce parking requirements over the last few years. For example, in response to comments from the Realtor's Change of Use Committee, a text amendment was presented to eliminate the need to bring parking into conformance for older structures in GMA 1 and 2 (UDO-211). In another example, the Pedestrian Business (PB) zoning district has had an automatic parking reduction of 30 percent due to the nature of the district being pedestrian oriented. Text amendment UDO-214 was approved by the City Council in 2010 extending that parking reduction to the General Business (GB) district to better accommodate pedestrian oriented mixed use development in that district.

While UDO amendments have been made to reduce parking requirements in our community, other amendments have required additional scrutiny related to parking in certain instances. Included in UDO-211 adopted in 2010 is a provision that if the land use is "Restaurant" in an older building without enough parking to meet current standards, an elected body Special Use Permit must be granted. This allows the majority of nonresidential uses to occupy older buildings without bringing the parking up to current standards but also allows for further scrutiny on a case-by-case bases of the more intense restaurant use which potentially could have a parking problem. Since UDO-211 was adopted, four Special Use Permits have been reviewed and all were approved after the petitioners demonstrated they could adequately accommodate the potential parking associated with their restaurant. Another example of additional scrutiny of the parking impacts is the elected body Special Use Permit which is required for off-site parking for multifamily and institutional uses in residential zoning districts. In the last ten years, 12 Special Use Permits have been requested by churches desiring this off-site parking arrangement, for example.

The subject text amendment was submitted in anticipation of a potential parking problem that may occur at one of the existing schools in GMA 2 if a stadium is built there. As mentioned above in the background information, no text amendment should be contemplated with a single site in mind. The nature of the more urban development patterns in GMA 1 and 2 along with the limited site area available for overflow parking in those areas do bring into question the possible parking constraints of new or expanded stadiums in close proximity to existing urban neighborhoods. However, the text amendment as submitted offered the possibility of either a Special Use Permit or Special Use District Zoning. Special Use Zoning would cover the subject in a broader context than just the parking impacts. Staff believes that school stadiums and at least some of the impacts during the year that emanate from them is part of what community life is about. It is the parking for large stadiums that has the most potential for disruption in the functioning of the neighborhood environment if not enough consideration has been given to any parking needs that go beyond the parking available on campus.

Therefore, staff believes that rather than proposing Special Use District Zoning for school stadiums in GMA 2, the amendment should require a Special Use Permit from the elected body for any school stadiums with over 1,500 seats in GMA 1 and 2 that don't have on-campus parking spaces sufficient to provide one parking space per four stadium seats. A Special Use Permit would be consistent with what the City Council already requires for restaurant parking on non-conforming older building sites in GMA 2, and church parking beyond the church site itself.

The 1,500 seat threshold is proposed because the on-campus parking required for students and faculty already should be sufficient for stadiums up to that size. The one space per four seat ratio was selected by reviewing the requirements of other large North Carolina cities.

Having a Special Use Permit process to consider parking for large school stadiums without on-campus parking at the one space per four seat ratio will allow consideration of special parking arrangements that schools can commit to, balanced with the potential parking and traffic impacts to surrounding neighborhoods.

RECOMMENDATION

APPROVAL of staff revisions to proposal.

**CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES FOR UDO-233
AUGUST 9, 2012**

Wesley Curtis was recused from consideration of this request due to his firm's relationship with the school system.

Arnold King stated that there has been a lot of misinformation and miscommunication about this issue. There are a lot of outstanding well-intentioned folks on each side of the issue of a stadium at Reynolds High School. We have gotten an equal number of comments from opponents and proponents of that issue.

However, the determination of placing a stadium next to Hanes Park is a decision for the School Board not the Planning Board.

The text amendment under consideration today deals with parking requirements for any and all school stadiums in GMA1 and GMA2 and the appropriate process to take if there is not sufficient parking to meet the code requirements.

Please restrict your comments today to the amount of parking needed for a stadium and the procedure to be followed if there is not enough parking.

Our rules for public hearing are normally 12 minutes per side. We're going to start off today with 15 minutes to a side and see if that's appropriate. We would suggest that one person be the primary contact for each side and sort of allocate the time rather than us making that decision up here.

David Reed presented the staff report.

PUBLIC HEARING

FOR:

Tom Terrell, 300 N. Greene St., Greensboro, NC 27401

- I represent the petitioner and a group called Save Hanes Park. However this text amendment is larger than any one stadium proposal.
- This issue before us today is whether any stadium in GMA1 or GMA2 that does not have adequate parking on its site shall be required to go through some form of public scrutiny.

- Scrutiny is a good thing, not a bad thing.
- Typical high school stadiums were what was contemplated when the existing ordinance was adopted in 2006. Stadium use at that time was infrequent and typically had low turnout.
- Mega stadiums were not contemplated when the current standards were adopted. Now there appears to be at least one proposal for a stadium that is four to five times the typical size stadium when the standards were set. It would be heavily used and would adjoin several established neighborhoods.
- The area already has inadequate parking.
- That situation is what has prompted this text amendment asking for public scrutiny of such large projects, especially when there may be inadequate parking.

Henry Lafferty, 1619 Lynwood Ave., Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- The proposed site for the stadium which prompted this amendment is on public school property in a highly developed area adjacent to Hanes Park, one of the oldest and most utilized parks in our city.
- The stadium development would be comparable or larger in size to some of the big box stores on Hanes Mall Boulevard.
- Facilities of this size have a substantial impact on surrounding neighborhoods. Lack of parking and increased traffic are two of the most significant effects that need to be addressed more concretely with such large projects.
- Even though Reynolds High School cannot currently adequately provide for its parking needs on site and must use neighborhood streets, no additional parking for a large stadium would be required under the current UDO.
- This amendment seeks to correct oversights made six years ago for parking and create a mechanism for site plan review with public input.
- I urge you to show your commitment to *Legacy* and to urban neighborhoods by approving this amendment.

John Coyne, 214 N. Hawthorne Rd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- From my front porch I have direct view of Hanes Park.
- People from all over the City use Hanes Park from before sunup to way past sundown.
- They come from every race and every income bracket. It is this diversity that makes this part so vibrant and so inclusive.
- Parking for current uses in this immediate area is inadequate. To allow such a large stadium, even on privately owned property, creates massive problems for the surrounding properties.
- In dense urban areas, schools' needs must be balanced with the needs of the entire community.
- UDO-233 does not reject building of school stadiums. Rather it calls for a reasonable approach to parking and approval by an elected body, all in alliance with *Legacy*.

Langdon Oppermann, 1500 Overbrook Ave., Winston-Salem, NC 27104.

- We're here because of the amendment passed in 2006 when parking requirements for stadiums were removed. The key point then was that stadiums were used only for home games and they wanted to avoid building parking lots which would only be used a few times a year. As a result the parking requirement for stadiums was eliminated.

- However stadiums and their uses have changed. There is now consideration of extremely large structures with very frequent usage.
- There is not always adequate parking for such a structure.
- Nearby businesses are concerned about traffic and parking.
- The purpose of this amendment is simply to consider parking for new and expanding parking stadiums in urban areas and give the public a chance to participate.
- It does not prohibit the construction of the stadium. It does not affect existing stadiums unless they expand. It does not change the zoning of any school property.
- This amendment has no effect on elementary schools or middle schools.
- Without UDO-233, large stadiums can be built with no communication to affected property owners or with any citizen. This sets a terrible precedent to other areas in our city.
- This amendment is not about Reynolds. The Reynolds project only brought this to the forefront.
- Recommending this amendment doesn't stop a stadium, but it makes sure that hundreds of neighbors' interests can be considered rather than completely ignored. Thank you.

Ben Towle, 1581 W. Northwest Blvd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I am here on behalf of Winston-Salem Neighborhood Alliance which represents over 19 neighborhoods.
- We support this text amendment.
- We feel when the institutions build in close proximity to residential neighborhoods where safety and community environment may be affected the project needs to be approved through public discussion, public input, and public approval.

Anne O'Brien, 2301 Buena Vista Rd., Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I'm a member of the RJR class of 2012.
- I'm also a member of the community that surrounds the site for the proposed Hanes Park Stadium which initiated this amendment.
- Residential and commercial areas grow up around our schools.
- It's important that we all respect each other and the boundaries that are naturally established by urban growth.
- It's only reasonable and right that this body should have oversight for projects of this nature.
- The site proposed next to the Hanes Park location is close to the medical center. In order to respect the need of emergency vehicles to have quick access to the hospital, there should be adequate parking leaving those pathways unblocked.

Bill Gibson, 1315 Brookstown Avenue, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- This amendment is about parking and about public process.
- Mr. Terrell is correct that zoning is about balancing interests and that scrutiny is a good thing.
- If you pass this amendment, you are confirming that Winston-Salem in 2012 is a sensible community.

Kathleen Ramich, 1318 Glade Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- I manage and live in an apartment building that fronts on Glade Street.
- On-street parking is used by patrons of nearby facilities. There are many nights, weekend, and weekdays when all the parking is taken up. To add another facility would create significantly more problems.
- With more vehicles trying to park along roads, emergency access to the hospital through this area would be challenging. As this is a major route for emergency access to the hospital, this could be very dangerous.

AGAINST:

Darrell Walker, 475 Corporate Square Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27105

- My role today is to represent the school district in general.
- There are 29 particular schools in GMA2. They are not all high schools, but some schools have changed classifications over the years.
- Even though we're talking about parking today, the Board of Education has not seen a final plan for the stadium being mentioned today.
- There has been no discussion about concerts and other activities.
- I'm a little disappointed that we're talking about a text amendment which just relates to schools.
- We need to do more planning together as a city and a county and the school system.
- We already go through a pretty extensive process with staff. There's a lot of discussion concerning every project that comes before them. There's never a rubber stamp.
- I'm not necessarily opposed to a seating ratio of 1 to 4. However, we would like to be able to use parking on existing school properties. In the situation which precipitated this amendment request, we can meet the requirement of 1 to 4 by using existing school campuses in surrounding areas.
- If the boundaries of GMA2 were ever expanded, that would likely involve more schools and stadiums which are going to have work done on them in the next five years.
- We are looking at the long-range plans.
- 400 parking spaces would cost us around \$2 million in today's world and we don't want to see those spaces sitting around empty.
- Please consider allowing us to use existing school properties around stadiums in GMA2.

Bill Powell, 475 Corporate Square Drive, Winston-Salem, NC 27105

- I also represent the school district.
- Reviewed statistics showing that current stadiums have plenty of parking for their capacities and the usual attendance.
- The primary purpose of stadiums is to educate our students.
- Stadiums are special. They are an accessory use.
- We constantly use contiguous spaces for parking for Friday night games. Emergency vehicles still get through.
- Different categories are possible: A new school could be a category. It would require Planning staff and Planning Board approvals. We could park as we have. There's nothing special about it.

- Second category: No new seats are added. When a stadium is renovated, parking as we have should be grandfathered.
- Third category: If a stadium cannot meet the count using all those items, there's always special use which can be used. We don't have to use it with many schools. Some of those already meet the 1 to 4 requirement.
- Our urban areas have a neutral to declining population. Schools follow that trend.
- Downtown has an increase in population, but not an increase in students.
- We shouldn't be creating rules that require bureaucracy.
- If we went through the entire public process, it would take approximately one year.
- We should be streamlining approvals to encourage new growth, encourage urban areas, generate excitement. We should not be encouraged to build asphalt lots.
- Ordinances should encourage shared and temporary parking including contiguous, green grass, on-site, churches, and business partners.
- The current site plan approval process already has review by transportation, engineering, streets, and fire.
- Schools have planned parking needs for years. Why is it special? We should save the special permits for special uses. If we can't get the parking on, it will be obvious, it will be a special use.
- But if we can do it the way we've been doing it, we should reject the amendment or modify it to use the items.
- We should encourage urban improvements.

Drew Davis, Spillman Thomas & Battle, 110 Oakwood Dr., Suite 500, Winston-Salem, NC 27103

- I actually live in the district impacted by the stadium.
- My law firm represents the RJ Reynolds Home Field Advantage group. This is the group that is endeavoring to raise money for the stadium to be constructed wholly on property owned by the Winston-Salem/Forsyth County Schools, adjoining other school owned properties.
- I believe this text amendment to be wholly inconsistent with the application and wholly inconsistent with the general practicality as it currently exists.
- We've heard already about the need for additional scrutiny, especially by the City Council.
- You review all zoning and similar types of requests, considering their compliance with *Legacy* and the *Unified Development Ordinances* (UDO).
- The level of scrutiny you and staff put into this is more than enough. It's been ample, consistent, reasonable, and appropriate.
- Passing this text amendment would mean City Council makes its own decision separate from what you desire to do. We think that's inappropriate and inconsistent with the UDO.
- Although we wouldn't be here if it wasn't for one particular stadium, this amendment will apply to many more stadiums. It affects 29 different schools in GMA2. If the GMA2 boundary changes, it will affect more schools.
- Additionally an increase in parking requirements creates a decrease in green space.
- It has unintended and undesired consequences such as stormwater runoff.
- There will be no change of use here. It's been school property and will remain school property.

- We understand that parking is a major concern in all stadiums.
- We can show you a diagram showing more parking spaces than I've described. Certainly there is an opportunity for a reasonable parking plan to go along with the stadium.
- We ask that you oppose UDO-233.

Chairman King noted that two other people had signed up to speak. However time for the opponents has expired. With the Board's agreement, Brad Fisher and Stan Dean were each given two minutes to speak and then four minutes were given to the proponents to speak.

Stan Dean, 215 NW Pine Valley Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I'm president of the Booster Club at Reynolds High.
- The stadium we are proposing is not a mega stadium. It is 4,500 seats which is smaller than most of the other high school stadiums in the County.
- This is not a \$60M "Texas stadium" as mentioned in the news. It is the minimum size required by the NC Athletic Association in order to host a playoff game.
- We already have over 1,100 spaces which gives us more than most if not all the other stadiums in the County. As you know, for the most part those stadiums are in residential areas.
- We have Bryson Auditorium which has 2,300 seats. When attendance is good, we will have 2,000 people there. We have had 1,300 a few times this past year, and used the parking that is already there. We don't get complaints about parking.
- We don't need to take additional steps, jump through more hoops to prove that we have adequate parking.
- There have been comments about lack of communication. We want to be good neighbors. Reynolds is a vital part of the neighborhood. We meet with them and we try to work things out with them. We do not want to impede on them.

Brad Fisher, 301 N. Hawthorne Road, Winston-Salem, NC 27104

- I'm the athletic director at Reynolds High School.
- Half of our students are not of driving age.
- Half of our students don't have the ability to have transportation.
- Parking won't be an issue for a lot of students. They'll be in the seats at the time.
- GMA2 covers a large area for high schools that are minority based. I think it's unfair to pass this amendment which would adversely affect those neighborhoods, those schools.
- Please vote against this amendment.

Patricia Sokoloff, 707 Summit Street, Winston-Salem, NC 27101

- We're talking about a historic area.
- Pouring 1,400 teenage drivers into a historic area is not a good formula for people who bought houses there and who didn't dream of having a stadium across the street.
- We all know parking will be a problem. There is already insufficient parking for Hanes Park. People will be parking in front of the businesses along Reynolda Road which will not allow their clientele to do business there. There will be parking in front of houses abutting Hanes Park.
- People in cars are going to park where they want to park, not in the areas which are designated.

Tom Terrell, 300 N. Greene St., Greensboro, NC 27401

- There is a huge disconnect between what you've heard this afternoon from members of the school system and what is being put on Facebook pages and emails and said in neighborhood meetings by backers of a very specific stadium proposal.
- Mr. Walker stated in his "damage control" that no one has ever said anything about concerts. I am sitting with two people who say on May 19th at an invitational meeting of the West Highlands Neighborhood Association at Fries Moravian Church he said there will be concerts at this stadium.
- Mr. Powell was quick to say there is always adequate parking. If that is the case, then this text amendment is innocuous. The problem comes when they start counting spaces designated for use by other facilities. This means the other facilities cannot be used.
- If everything works out so fine in reviews, etc., then this text amendment gives them an opportunity to prove it and it brings the neighbors into the process.

WORK SESSION

During discussion by the Planning Board, the following points were made:

Chairman King declared the public hearing closed. He made the following comments and suggestions.

This site we're talking about is school property. The project is scheduled to be presented to the School Board next month. If the project is approved, the total cost won't be known for some time afterwards. Then fund-raising will begin. It will be several years before the project can begin. As a result there is not a pressing need to address the parking issues right now.

There are going to be some unintended consequences. We just don't know what they are right now. We could be trying to fix a problem that doesn't exist and perhaps create other problems in the process. The Board needs to consider this matter a bit more before we make a decision. My recommendation to the Board is that we continue this for two months, to October 11. For the audience, that is the longest we can continue it so a recommendation will be made at that meeting. It will then go forward to City Council.

If the school system decides to build this stadium as proposed, then we need to consider narrowing this text amendment down to apply to this particular stadium and not the other 29 schools in GMA2. We do not want to make it impractical or unaffordable to build another urban high school in Winston-Salem. One of our stated goals in *Legacy* is to reduce parking requirements, not increase them, especially in the urban core.

I would say to the opponents if you do not want a stadium next to Hanes Park, you need to be talking to the School Board, not the Planning Board.

Board members expressed their support of having an opportunity to digest this information and consider the possible long-term consequences of such an amendment.

Allan Younger asked both sides of the issue to consider whether there might be some sort of compromise that they could both support.

MOTION: Clarence Lambe moved to continue the zoning text amendment to October 11, 2012.

SECOND: Paul Mullican

VOTE:

FOR: Arnold King, Clarence Lambe, Darryl Little, Barry Lyons, Lynne Mitchell, Paul Mullican, Brenda Smith, Allan Younger

AGAINST: None

EXCUSED: Wesley Curtis

**CITY-COUNTY PLANNING BOARD
PUBLIC HEARING
MINUTES FOR UDO-233
OCTOBER 11, 2012**

Wesley Curtis was recused from consideration of this request due to his firm's relationship with the school system.

David Reed presented a brief recap of this request.

PUBLIC HEARING

**NOTE: PUBLIC HEARING WAS HELD
AND CLOSED ON AUGUST 9, 2012**

WORK SESSION

During discussion by the Planning Board, the following points were made:

Arnold King: The parking requirements for this are more stringent than for similar uses such as the ballpark. For instance, BB&T Stadium has a 5,500 seat stadium with 800 parking spaces, a one to six ratio. Groves Stadium has 33,000 seats with 3,700 spaces, a one to nine ratio. School systems use public money and I have trouble holding them to a higher standard than we do other facilities. Most of the time 300 to 400 spaces would be sufficient based on their average attendance now.

Barry Lyons: The location has to be considered. The proximity to housing and neighborhood parking situations needs to have some requirements.

Lynne Mitchell: This is just proposing a public process, requiring the school to demonstrate that it would work. Public process is always a good thing.

Barry Lyons: Putting anything through a public process only serves to strengthen it's viability. More people may buy into a project if the public process is not forgone.

Arnold King: What is the definition of "on site"? Commonly owned property contiguous only owned by the school system will be considered one zoning lot for this purpose. This would get them to one to five.

Paul Norby: If you have a ratio of one to four, you would be exempt. Going above that would not mean denial of the project; it would simply mean going through the public process. We have several items go through this public process every year.

Arnold King: It is just another step in the process.

Allan Younger: I'm a big supporter of the public process: however, I'm not convinced that this would be the best thing for the students. I'm not necessarily convinced that the parking needs to be on site. If it can make sense to have parking close by and it does not cause a problem for the neighborhood, I would support that. I'm not convinced this is the right thing to do to pass this text amendment and therefore potentially end the opportunity for there to be a stadium at Reynolds.

Lynne Mitchell: This is a growing pain struggle. We will grow by 100,000 to 120,000 people by 2030. We look at where we are and where we want to be. Intensity will change things for people.

Paul Mullican: Would it help anything if we changed this ratio?

Arnold King: I have trouble saying there has to be 750 parking spaces when they are likely to only be used a couple times a year. The neighbors will be only inconvenienced a couple of times a year.

Paul Mullican: We are trying to reduce the amount of asphalt.

Barry Lyons: When anything has such an intensive use, a public process should be put in to place. A public forum would provide an opportunity for compromise to be reached. If there's no reason to oppose it, it happens. Otherwise a public forum would be helpful to work toward a compromise.

MOTION: Lynne Mitchell moved approval of the zoning map amendment.

SECOND: Barry Lyons

VOTE:

FOR: Darryl Little, Barry Lyons, Lynne Mitchell

AGAINST: Arnold King, Paul Mullican, Allan Younger

EXCUSED: Wesley Curtis

MOTION FAILED. Report will be sent to the City Council with no recommendation.

A. Paul Norby, FAICP
Director of Planning

Written comments submitted by Planning Board members:

Arnold King: My recommendation would be to recognize that a stadium is an approved accessory use to a school and let the WS/FCS Board of Education determine the appropriate amount of parking to satisfy the parents, students, school administrators, and neighborhoods surrounding the schools. The Board of Education is an elected body that should be entrusted to make these decisions. Although a proposed 3,000 seat stadium is being discussed for Reynolds High School, most activities (field hockey, soccer, lacrosse, JV football, band, etc.) will not put any pressure on school parking. Most football games will not. It's my understanding that Reynolds had only two (2) games last year with attendance more than 1,500. With the exception of perhaps 2-3 games each year, there is already sufficient parking available on-site at Reynolds without even considering the public street parking available. To require an additional 200-300 paved parking spaces on-site at Reynolds for use only 2-3 times per year seems like an unnecessary expenditure of public funds. My recommendation would be for a Special Use Permit for stadiums and stadium expansions with more than a total of 3,000 seats in GMA 1 and 2 unless there is adequate off-street parking on the school site to meet a one (1) space per six (6) seat parking requirement. A 1:6 ratio is more stringent than what was approved for BB&T Ballpark, Groves Stadium and Bowman Gray Stadium. This would be consistent with parking requirements at other high schools in the system. The 1:6 ratio deals with on-site parking requirements and would recognize that there are off-site parking options available to supplement this parking requirement. This puts the burden on the WS/FCS Board of Education to provide adequate parking without imposing an arbitrary requirement to build a couple hundred additional parking spaces that would be used only a couple times each year.

ORDINANCE
UDO-233
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING
CHAPTER B OF THE *UNIFIED DEVELOPMENT ORDINANCES*
TO AMEND THE REVIEW REQUIREMENTS FOR SCHOOL STADIUMS IN
GROWTH MANAGEMENT AREAS 1 AND 2

Be it ordained by the City Council of the City of Winston-Salem, North Carolina, that the *Unified Development Ordinances* is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1. Chapter B, Article II of the UDO is amended as follows:

Chapter B – Zoning Ordinance
Article II - Zoning Districts, *Official Zoning Maps*, and
Uses

2-5 USE CONDITIONS

2-5.69 SCHOOL, PUBLIC

The following conditions apply to public schools in all zoning districts where permitted:

(A) School Stadiums

- (1) Stadiums.** A school stadium may be located on the same zoning lot as any public secondary school.
- (2) Stadium and Playground Area Setbacks.** School stadiums, including the parking areas, or other playground areas, shall be set back not less than fifty (50) feet from the property lines of any adjacent residentially zoned property.
- (3) Bufferyards.** A fence option bufferyard of type II, as specified in Section B.3-5, shall be provided along the side and rear property lines between any school stadium and any property zoned for residential use.
- (4) Parking for Stadiums in GMA 1 and 2.** A Special Use Permit from the Elected Body in accordance with Section B.6-1.5 must be granted for new stadiums and stadium expansions with more than a total of 1,500 seats in GMA 1 and 2 unless there is adequate off-street parking on the school site to meet a one (1) space per four (4) seat parking requirement.

Section 2. This ordinance shall become effective upon adoption.